DOCUMENT BESUME

ED 144 763

. RC 010 116

AUTHOR TITLE Picou, J. Steven; Howard, William G.

Motivational Determinants of Status Aspirations:

Comments on Sex Variations.

INSTITUTION

Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Texas

'Agricultural Experiment Station,

SPONS AGENCY

Coopérative State Research Service (DOA), Washington,

D.C.

REPORT NO

TAES-H-2811; TAES-H-2893; USDA/CSRS-S-81

PUB DATE Apr 76

PUB DATE NOTF

36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the

Southwestern Sociological Society (Ballas, Texas,

April 1976)

EDRS PRICE

MF-\$C.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS -

*Academic Aspiration; Caucasians; High School Students; *Occupational Aspiration; Parents; Peer Groups; *Rural Orban Differences; Seniors; *Sex Differences; Sex Role; *Socialization; *Social

Reinforcement; Social Status; Teachers

IDENTIFIERS.

*Louisiar.a

ABSTRACT

.The impact of sex-role socialization on career-related status orientation's was examined in an attempt to specify, by sex, differential reference group influence and motivational variations. Data were derived from a larger data-set on mobility and achievement orientations of a random sample of 1970 senior students stratified according to residence of school (urban-rural), size of senior class, race, and school type. This study was limited to information on white males (N=1,221) and females (N=1,241). Pegression models were used to test a series of research hypotheses developed from sex-role socialization literature. Covariance analysis assessed both main and interaction effects of /sex. The empirical findings supported the general theme of sex-role socialization, showing that males received more college encouragement and achievement training from parents and had more materialistic orientations than female counterparts. Though low status achievements characterized females who received minimum amounts of parental and peer encouragement to gotto college and who had low academic performance and parental achievement training, no similar male trend was observed. While personal competitiveness positively influenced male status orientation, it played no role for the female. However, females with a strong materialistic orientation tended to have higher status education orientations than malas. (RS)

Documents acquired by EPIC include many informal unpublished materials not available to an other sources. EPIC make every strong to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless atems of hargeral reproductions, are liften encountered and this attemptable, at the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available on the FPIC December Reproductors Service (1938) and not responsible for the quality of the original document. Peproductions, apole 15 (FPIC) at the fest that can be made from December 1.

Mogivational Determinants of Status Aspirations: Comments on Sex Variations*

J. Steven Picou

and

William G. Howard

Texas A&M University

O S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
MATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM ATING IT, POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DUCATION OR POLICY

*Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Southwestern Sociological Society, April 1976, Dallas, Texas. This research was sponsored by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station as a contribution to TAES Research Reports, H-2811 and USDA (CSRS) Regional Research Project S-81, "Development of Human Resource Potentials of Rural Youth in the South and Their Patterns of Mobility, TAES Research Project H-2893 and USDA (CSRS) Regional Research Project NE89, "Community Structure and Quality of Life: Measurement and Analysis." The authors acknowledge the technical contributions of Donald Book and John Womack to this study; the secretarial assistance provided by Barbara Miller is gratefully acknowledged. The authors assume sole responsibility for any errors contained herein.

PARTY CIO : TO REPRODUCE THE . MATHRIAL HAS BEEN ON A YIED BY

: NO 010116

J. Steven licon

FRIC STEEL OF TRACE

9

Motivational Determinants of Status Aspirations: Comments on Sex Variations

J. Steven Picou and William G. Howard

Paper Summary

Recent empirical research has documented the fact that sex has a rather consistent "depressant effect" on educational and occupational achievements of American adults (e.g., Alexander and Eckland, 1974). However, the specific nature of the process by which female achievements are restricted remains to be empirically documented. Most often, researchers allude to the importance of sex-role socialization and labor market discrimination for explaining male-female achievement discrepancies; this study focuses on the former issue, that is, sex-role socialization, in an attempt to specify differential reference group influence and motivational variations, by sex, for the formation of career-related status orientations.

Theoretically, we approach our research problem in terms of the literature on sex-role socialization. Numerous publications emphasize that in American society, the "cultural mandate" stipulates that women should be oriented primarily to familial roles rather than work-roles; males, in entrast, receive cultural directives stressing occupational primacy (e.g., see: Coser and Rokoff, 1971; Parson's and Bales, 1953; Douvan and Adelson, 1966). More specifically, female sex-role socialization is characterized by "ambivalency" and an emphasis noncompetitive, accomodating, affiliative role behaviors which also stresses dependency relationships with parents; in contrast males are thought to be more aggressive, competitive and independent—in short, more achievement—oriented (e.g., among others, see: Simon and Gagnon, 1969; Freeman, 1970; Hochschild, 1973; Vetter, 1975). In fact, Honer (1972) asserts that females "fear success," particularly success stemming from competition.

situations where females compete with males.

In light of this vast body of literature, the following research hypotheses were developed:

H₁: Motivational attributes, i.e., materialistic orientations and personal competitiveness, are more important for the formation of career-related status orientations of males than females.

The sextrole socialization literature also suggests that female reference-group structures discourage achievement behaviors of women by emphasizing the priority of familial roles over work roles (e.g., see Curry et al. Forthcoming, 1976). From this general theme, the following research hypotheses were developed:

- Hales receive more achievement socialization from parents, teachers, and peers (reference group memebers) for career-related status orientations than their female counterparts.
- H_{2A}: Males will receive more encouragement to attend college from reference group members than females.
- H_{2B}: The impact of reference group achievement socialization on career-related status orientations will be greater for males.

Furthermore, from the recent research on the state attainment process, it can be contended that family socio-economic status is a more important determinant of female status orientations than males. That is, female career achievements are more "class-sponsored" than males. The following research hypothesis was developed from this line of research (see Pin, et al., 1976, for a review of these studies):

H₃: The career-related status orientations of females are more highly dependent on social structural factors than the eareer-related status orientations of males.

Stemming from the logic (presented above) regarding ascribed statuses, it can be argued that the career-related status orientations of males are more dependent on ability characteristics, i.e. achieved statuses. The

3

.following hypothesis was developed from this perspective:

H₄: Males! career-related status orientations are more dependent on achieved ability characteristics than females.

* The Data

The data utilized in this study were derived from a larger data-set on mobility and achievement orientations of Louisiana youth. The original sample was drawn utilizing a proportionate, stratified, random, cluster technique. Affichigh schools within the state were stratified in terms of four primary demographic characteristics: (1) residence of school (urban-rural); (2) size of senior class (small, medium, and large); (3) race (black-white); (4) school type (public-parochial). Schools were randomly selected from these strata.

Collection of the data occurred in the fall semester, 1970. Group interviews were conducted and all senior class members who were in attendance on pre-scheduled interview days participated in the study. Correspondence with school officials revealed that normal rates of absence characterized all interview sessions. A total of 3,245 respondents comprised the final sample. This study is concerned solely with those respondents who classified themselves as white males (N=1221) and white females (N=1241).

Results and Conclusions

A set of regression models was generated and our analysis includes a consideration of the effects of social structural, interpersonal influence and motivational attributes for educational aspirations and expectations and occupational aspirations and expectations (Tables 2-9). Furthermore, a covariance analysis was conducted to assess both main and interaction effects of sex (Tables 10-13). The results of the regression analysis can be

summarized as follows .:

(A.) Educational Aspirations

- (1.) The effect of academic performance on education aspirations was significant and positive for both sex groups.
 - (2.) Peer college plans and parental college encouragement had stronger effects for males.
- (3.) Teacher college encouragement was found to be a significant predictor for females and not males.
- (4.) Both motivational variables, materialistic orientations (MO) and personal competitiveness (PC) were significant predictors only for males educational aspirations.
- (5.) The R² for the male model was larger (.327) than for the female model (.231).
- (6.) The interpersonal influence variables explained relatively more variance in educational aspirations than the structural and motivational variables.

(B.) Occupational Aspirations

- (1.) Academic performance, peer college plans, and parents college encouragement were stronger predictors for the occupational aspiratons of males.
- (2.) Residence and fathers' occupation were significant social structural variables for male occupational aspirations, while mothers' education was the only significant structural variable for females.
- (3.) The motivational variables were not found to be significant for either sex group.
- (4.) The R^2 for the male model (.325) was larger than the R^2 for the female model (.128).

(C.) Educational Plans

- (1.) Academic performance was a stronger predictor of males' educational plans.
- (2.) Peer college plans, parents college encouragement and parents achievement socialization practices were all stronger predictors of male educational plans.
- (3.) Personal competitiveness was a stronger predictor of male educational plans.
- (4,) The R^2 for the male model (.445) was larger than R^2 for the female model (.361).

(D.) Occupational Plans

- (1.) Academic performance was a stronger predictor of males educational plans.
- (2) Peer college plans, parents' college encouragement and parents' achievement socialization practices were all stronger predictors of males' occupational plans.
- (3.) Personal competitiveness was a stronger-predictor for males, occupational plans.
- (4.) The R^2 for the male model (.338) was larger than the R^2 for the female model (.152).

The results of the covariance analysis can be summarized as follows:

ERIC Foundation by ERIC

(A.) Educational Aspirations

(1.) A significant interaction obtained between sex and materialistic orientation. Females with high material orientations have higher-level educational aspirations than other interaction variable combinations.

(B.) Occupational Aspirations

(1.) A significant interaction was found between sex and father's occupation. Females with fathers in low-status occupations have lower-status job aspirations.

(2.) Significant interactions between sex and academic performance, sex and parents' college encouragement, and sex and peers' college plans. Females with low academic performance, females who receive little encouragement from parents to attend college and females with peers who are not oriented toward college attendance have lower-status aspirations.

(C.) Éducational Plans

(1.) A significant interaction effect was found between sex and family structure. Females from broken families pave higher level educational plans.

(2.) Assignificant interaction effect was found for sex and warent's encouragement to attend college.

(D) Occupational Plans

- (1.) The following interaction effects were replicated for occupational plans--sex by father's occupation, sex by academic performance, sex by peer college plans, sex by parents' encouragement.
- (2.) A significant interaction effect was found for sex and parental achievement socialization practices. Females who received very little achievement socialization had lower-status job plans.
- (3.) For all covariance analyses the R² values for interaction effects were relatively minimal.

Summary

In general, the analysis provides support for the following hypotheses:

H₁; H₂; H_{2a}; H_{2b}. Hypotheses 3 and 4 must be rejected due to inconsistent empirical results. Support for hypotheses 1, 2, 2A and 2B was also generated by the result of the covariance analysis. Specifically, we interpret these empirical tindings as supporting the general theme of sex-role socialization. Ostensibly, rales receive more encouragement from parents to attend college, receive more achievement training from parents, and have orientations fore

materialistic than their female counterparts. Furthermore, low status orientations for achievement tend to characterize females who receive minimum amounts of encouragement to attend college; who have peer friends who are not college-oriented; who have low-levels of academic performance; and who have parents who do not reward and emphasize the virtues of independence, competition, and academic achievements. No similar trend was observed for males. Furthermore, personal competitiveness has a positive influence on males status orientations, but virtually plays no role for the formation of females status orientations.

The interaction effects observed for sex and materialistic orientations and sex and family structure provide an interesting basis to speculate about the nature and dynamics of sex-role socialization. The "cultural mandate" in our society clearly distinguishes between the qualities of "male roles" vis-a-vis "female roles." Females, in contrast to males, receive differential socialization for achievement. As such females, more often than males, lack interpersonal support for status attainment. Furthermore, it appears that the sex-role socialization process is complex and viable theoretical alternatives need further exploration.

The finding that females from broken families have relatively highlevel educational plans suggests that the view of the broken-family as an
inhibitor of achievement behavior is accurate only for males. The "broken
family," in this instance can be viewed as "pathological" for the maintenance
of sex-role differences. The transmission of sex-role behaviors, which
places women in at a "disadvantage" in the achievement process, is pestricted
by what is commonly viewed as another structural liability, non-intact family
structure. A similar serendipitous find g, which may have significant.
theoretical import, was found for materialistic orientations. *Males seem-

to be "disadvantaged" (or "advantaged") because strong materialistic orientations apparently discourage college attendance; thereby lowering status-levels of occupational orientations. However, females, who have strong materialistic orientations tend to have higher status education aspirations. Apparently, similar cognitive orientations produce different outcomes for males and females. The concept of multifinality in systems theory may be the appropriate description of this rather interesting interaction effect.

In summary, the differential structural achievements of females, vis-a-vis males appears to be partly the result of sex-role socialization. Combined with a consideration of labor market discrimination, differential sex-role socialization appears to be an important element for explaining patterns of sex inequality in contemporary society.

Table 1. T-Tests for Male-Female Contrasts.

Variable	Males X	Females X	T-Value	Pr
Parents' College Encouragement	4.32	3.99	9.17	.0001
Parent's Achievement Socialization	. 0 6 18	0551	3.17	.002 /
Materialistic Orientation	, 1831	1825	11.09	.0001
Educational Aspirations	4:835	4,260	5.27	.0001
Occupational Aspirations	73.89	73.56	.9 [.] 3	N.S.
Educational Plans	3.33	2.50	9.07	.0001
Occupational Plans	71,11	72.86	-4.37	.0001

Table 2. Regression Analysis for Females' Educational Aspirations.

Step	· Predictor Variables	b ·	вета	R ²	R ² Change	• F-Value
	X ₁ Father's Education	.024	.052 -	044	.044	.811
	X ₂ Nother's Education	.065	.066	060	.016	4.090*
1	X ₃ Residence	033	055	.060	.000	.035.
	X ₄ Family Structure	028	-: 003 ·	.061	.001	.016
, ,	· X ₅ Father's Occupation	.010	.040	.067	.006	1. 438
	X ₆ Academic Performance	1.001	.238	.163	.095	68.539*
• .	X ₇ Peer College Plans	1.181	.209 /	208	· * 045 ~	49.501*
2	X ₈ Prent's College Encouragement	.295	.106	.223	·.015	12:178*
)	X ₉ Teacher's College Encouragement	273	.088	229	.006	8.987*,
•	X ₁₀ Parent's Achievement Socialization	057	019	. 230	000	.482
	X ₁₁ Materialistic Orientation	.035	.001	.230	.000	.158
3 , 	X ₁₂ Personal Competitiveness	.261	036	.231	.001	1.750

^{*} P < .05.

Table 3. Regression Analysis for Males' Educational Aspirations.

Step Predictor Variables	, b .	BETA.	R ²	R Change	F-Value
X Father's Education	.054	.076	.111	. 111	· _ 4.960* .
X' Nother's Education	.034	035	.112	.011	1.347
1 X ₃ Residence		.017	. 129 -	.007	.395
. X ₄ Family Structure	262	:035	.129	.000	1.934
X ₅ Father's Occupation	.029	.116	.148	, .019	14.287*
X ₆ Academic Performance	.921	. - 220	.230	.083	70.776*
X7 Peer College Plans	1. 468	.242	298	.068	77.411*)
2 · X ₈ Parent's College Encouragement	. 493	.146	320	.021	24186*
X ₉ Teacher's College Encouragement	.098	.030	. 320	.001	1.106
X ₁₀ Parent's Achievement Socialization	.038	.013	. 320	.000	. 247
X ₁₁ Materialistic Orientation	298	◆. 064	.324	.004	6.462*
X ₁₂ Personal Competitiveness	436 •	.058	327	.003	5.356*

Table 4. Regression Analysis for Females' Occupational Aspirations.

Step	Predictor Variables	ь	ВЕТА	R ² ·	R ² Change	F-Valu e
*	X ₁ Father's Education	.095	.056	. 045	,045	2.124
	X ₂ Mother's Education	.119	.053	.054	.009・	2.325
1	X ₃ Residence	1.161	.080	.062	.008	7.017*
•	X ₄ Family Structure	-1.115	061	.063	.001	4.431*
	X ₅ Father's Occupation	.038	.068	070	.006	3.662
	X ₆ Academic Performance	1.472	.153	.107	.037	24.427*
. +	· X ₇ Peer College Plans	1.659	.128	-123	.016	16.365*
2	X _g Parent's College Encouragement	.289	.045	. 126	.003	1.958
	X _q Teacher's College Encouragement	.220	.031	.127	.001	974
•	X ₁₀ Parent's Achievement Socialization	.050	.007	. 127	.000 _µ	.062
	X ₁₁ Materialistic Orientations	123	017	. 127	•.000	.320
3	X ₁₂ Personal Competitiveness .	.513	.031	. 128	.001	1.130

*P < .05.

Table 5. Regression Analysis for Males' Occupational Aspirations.

Step :	Fredictor Variables	b	BETA	R ²	R ² Change	· F-Value
	X, Father's Education	.078	.028	.104	.104	. 674
•	X ₂ Mother's Education	.126	.034	.114	010	. 1.235
1	X ₃ Residence	2.369	.103	.144	.030	15.272*
•	X, Pamily Structure	684	- 023	.144	.000	. 880
	X ₅ Father's Occupation,	.179	1 .187	.180	036	36.938*
—— , `	X Academic Performance	3.027	. 187	.241	.061	50.926*
	X, Peer College Plans	6.071	.259	311	. 070	88.112*
2	"X ₈ Parent's College Encouragement	1.508	.115	.323	:012	15.025*
4	X _q Teacher's College Encouragement	.078	.006	.323	:000	.047
	X ₁₀ Parent's Achievement Socialization	.172	.015	. 324	.000	.330
- 	X ₁₁ Materialistic Orientation	122	010	. 324	.000	.148
3	X ₁₂ Personal Competitiveness	.974	.033	.325	.001	1.783

^{*} P < .05. .

-: 17

13

Table 6. Regression Analysis for Females' Educational Plans.

Step	Predictor Variables		· · · ·	, b	BÈTA	· R ²	Change	F-Value.
•	X ₁ Pather's Education		1	.030 '.	.051	.091	.091	2.454
	X2 Mother's Education		, eg _X ,	.107	.136	.,132	.041	20.718*
1	X ₃ Residence	* *		.053	eTI1 .	133	`. 000 ′	:165
•	X ₄ Family Structure	. ,	•	.308,	:049	.141	. 009	3.768
	X ₅ Father's Occupation			.006	.032	. 147	.006	1.104.
•	X ₆ Academic Performance	-		.731	.216 ,	.2 40	.092	, 67.047*
	X7 Peer College Plans		4	1.218	. 269	.316	.077	98.226*
2	X ₈ Parent's College Encou	ragement	·	. 466	.208	. 359	.042	56.684*
	X ₉ Teacher's College Enco	ıragement		.07 9	. 032	.359 1	.001	1.421
	X ₁₀ Parent's Achievement	Socializat:	ion	.020	.008	. 359	.000	.110
	X ₁₁ Materialistic Orienta	tion'		.047	.018	. 360	000	.522
, 3 .	X ₁₂ Personal Competitiven	es s		.173	.030	. 361	.001	1.429

[•] FP ...05.

· · 1 J

20 2

Table 7. Regression Analysis for Males" Educational Plans.

Step,	Predictor Variables	b	BETA	R ²	, R ² Change	· F-Value
,	.X ₁ Father's Education	.077	.121	.168	.168	15.166*
	X2 Mother's Education	.061	.071,	190	.022	· 6.531*
1.	X3 Residence	.086.	.016	.198	.008	.466
	X ₄ Family Structure	192	029	.198	.000	1.593
,	X ₅ Father's Occupation	.023	.103	.215	.017	13.589*
,	.X ₆ Academic Performance	. 939	.252	.323	.10,7	112.312*
	X Peer College Plans	1.272	236	394	.072	88.698*
2	X ₈ Parent's College Encouragement -	.671	.223	.439	045	68.340*
,	X _q Teacher's College Encouragement	.022	007	. 439	.000	.082
	X ₁₀ Parent's Achievement Socialization	.133	.050	.441	.002	4.511*
	X ₁₁ Materialistic Orientation	055	019	, 442	.000	688
3	X ₁₂ Personal Competitiveness	. 405	.060	. 445	.004	7.083*

* P - .05

Table 8: Regression Analysis for Females' Occupational Plans.

Step	Predictor Variables	b	BETA	R ²	R ² Change	F-Value
	Father,'s Education	.102	.057	.Ó52	.052	2.263
	X ₂ Mother's Education	.119	.050	.062	.009	2.141
, 1	X	1.492	.098	:074 -	.012	10.694*
	X _A Family Structure	666	035	.074	.óoo	1.459
*	X ₅ Father's Occupation	.043	.073	.081	.007	4.360
***********	X6 Academic Performance	1.713	.168	. 125	.044	30.536*
_ •	X ₇ Peer College Plans	2.249	.164	.149 ,	02,4	27.620* ⁻
2	X ₈ Parent's College Encouragement	.239 .	.035	.150	.001	1, 233
	Xo Teacher's College Encouragement	016	.002	.150 ·	.000	.005
,	X ₁₀ Parent's Achievement Socialization	. 1,04	.014	.151	.000	.244
	X Mate-ialistic Orientation	217	028	. 151	.001	.924
	X ₁₂ Personal Competitiveness	.556	.032	.152	.001 _V	1.223
	14				•	-

*P < .05.

Table 9. Regression Analysis for Males' Occupational Plans.

Step	Predictor Variables	b	BETA	R ²	R ² Change	F-Value
espe	Father's Education	.121	.038	.117	.117	1.264.
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	other's Education 1.	.138	.032	.128	012 م	1.134
1	Residence	2.211	.083	.153	.025	10.199*
•	X ₄ Family Structure	206	006	. 154	001	.061
<i>\$</i> `	A ₅ Father's Occupation	.234	.213	.199	.045	48.752*
, ,	· Karcademic Performance	3.633	1.95	. 265	.066	56.251*
• •	X; Feer College Plans	5.051	.187	. 309	.044	46.771*
2	Xg Parent's College Encouragement	1.800	. 120	. 326 .	.017	16.429*
_ *	Teacher's College Encouragement	.501	.034	.327	.001	. 1.487
-	Parent's Achievement Socialization	1.045	.078	.333	.006	.4 9.375*
	Materialistic Orientation ,	064	042·	. 334	.001	2.776
3	X ₁₂ Personal Competitiveness	2.162	.064	.338	.004	6.736*

*P - 1.)5

Table 10. Analysis of Covariance for Educational Aspirations.

'Step	Predictor Variables	b .	BETA	R ²	R ² Change	Cumulative R ² for Var- iables in Step	F-Value	g 10./-
-			0.0000	0.07507	2 07-07	٠,		_
	Father's Education	0.02406,		0.07627	0.07627		O ^ 857	
	Mother's Elucation	0.06487.	0.06666	0.09026	0.01399	•	4.294*	
1	Residence	-0103235	- -0.00528	0.09163	0.00137	4× -	0.034	
•	Family Structure	-0.02587	-0.00334	0.09173	"0.00010		0.015 -	
	Pather's Occupation	0.00075'	0.03959	0.10377	0.01205		1.493	٠.
	Sex	-0.74330	-0.13878	0411257	0.00880	.1125	0.734	
,	Sex X FED,	0.03006	0.07347	0.11567	0:00309	•	0.697	,
	Sex X MED	-0.03049	-0.07064	0.11570	0.00Q03	•	0.495	
2	Sex X DUURB	0.13007	0.02334	0.11735	0.00165		0.300	
	Sex X FOCC	0.01893	0.24377	0.11814	0.00079		2.895	
,`	Sex X. TCTFAM	-0.23602	-0.04385	0.11846	- 0.00032	.00588	0.679	
1	Academic Performance	1.00258	0.24125	0,20629	0.08783		70,693*	
	Peer College Plans	1.18073	0.20112	0.26182	0.05553		51.720*	
ا	Parent's College Encour.	0.29557	0.09787	0.27929	0.03333	1	12.755*	
,	Teacher's College Encour.	0.27290	0.08541	0.28223	0.00293	.*	9.379*	
	Parents Achievement Socializ.	06165	-0.02088	. 0.28324	0.00002	.16378	0.561	
	Sex X GPA	-0.08099	-0.04123	0.28224	0,00000		0.245	
_ ′	Sex X PEERCOL	0.28947	0.05225	0.28224	0.00000	1	1.498	
4	Sex X PARENDENC	0.19803	0.16527	0.28344	0.00051	No.	2.258	
7	Sex X TCHEDEN	-0.17512	-0.14010	0.28409	0.00031	h - *	1.811	
	Sex X PASFAC	0.09060	0.02264			.00211	0.659	
<u></u>	, SEX A TRISTAG			0.28435	0.00025	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
•	Materialistic Orientation	0.04365	0.01354	0.28506	0.00070	, , ,	0.230	
5	Personal Competitiveness ;	0.26127	0.03526	0.28710	0.00204	<u>`</u>	1.827 .	
· 	Sex X AA06	0.17399	0.01727	0.28722	0.00011		0.407	
6	Ser X MO	-0.25154	-0.03226	0.28722	0.00139	.00150	4.200*	
·		<u> </u>		V. 20000	0.00131	100100		

Table 11. Main and Interaction Effects for Educational Plans.

		•	<u> </u>	2	2	Cumulative R ² for Var- iables in	,
Step	Predictor Variables	Ъ	BETA	R ²	R ² Change	Step	F-Value
		V		•			
*	Father's Education	0.03047	0.04864	0.13021	0.13021	•	2.315
	Mother's Education	0.10663	0.12770	0.10109	0.03088	- :-	19.536*
1.	• Residence	0.05348	0.01018-	0.16306	0.00197		0.157
	Family Structure	0.30844	0.04639	0.16451	0 .0 0145	-	3.560
	Father's Occupation	0.00627	0.02966	0.17592	0.01141		1.039
·-	Sex -	-1.26133	-0.27446	0.20143	0.02552	20143	3.559
	Sex X FED	0.04627	0.13179	0.02543	0.00400		2.781
	Sex X MED ,	-0.04579	-0:12363	0.20562	0.00019		1.878
2	Sex X DUURB	0.03324	0.00695	0.20707	0.00146	•	0.003
	Sex X FOCC	0.01636	0.24560	10. 20792	0.00085	•	3.643
, ,	Sex X TCTFAM	-0.50149 ·	-0.10860	0.20987	0.00195	.0084	5.161*
. ,	Academic Performance	0.73096	0.20500	0.30707	0.09720		63.272*
•	Peer college Plans	1,21776	0.24175	0.37802	0.03720		92.632*
3 '	Parent's College Encour.	0.46641	0.17999	- 0.41918	0.04116		53.479*
,	Teacher's College Encour.	0.07952	0.02901	0.41950			1.341
٠	Parents Achievement Socialia		0.00776	0.42027	0.00077	.22040	0.096
· **	Sex' X GPA	0.20858	0.12377	0.42165	0.00138	,	2.741
•	Sex X PEERCOL	0.05539	0.01164	× 0.42177	0.00013		0.092
4	Sex X PARENDENC	0,20576	0.20013	0.42298	0.00013	<i>t</i> .	47104*
	Sex X TCHEDENC	-0.05734	-0.05346	0.42309	0.00011	•	0.327
. • .	Sex X PASFAC	0.10218	0,02976	0.42347	0.00038	.0032	1 .412
	Materialistic Orientation	0.04950	0.01790	0.42348	0.00000	 	0.498
5 .	Personal Competiveness	0:17289	0.02719	0.42545	0.0019!	.00198	1.347
	Sex X AA06	0.23267	0.02692	0.42576	0.00031		1.225
6	Sex X MO	-0.10812	-0.02851	0.42610	0.00035	.0066	1.307

**P →* •05

Table 12. Main and Interaction Effects for Occupation Aspirations.

	Step	Predictor Variables	b	BETA	R ²	R ² Change	Cumulative R ² for Var- iables in Step	F-Value
				• •	``		<u> </u>	
		Father's Education	10.09482	0.04066	0.07691	0.07691 ·		1.283
		Mother's Education	-0.11958	0.03846	0.08630	0.00938 -		1.406
	1	Residence	1.16306	-0.05946	0,10601	0.01971		4.233*
^ ,	, ` ' -	Family Structure	-1.11280	-0.04495	0.10604	- 0.00003		2.652
		Father's Occupation -	0.03809	.0.04841	0.12660	0:02057	•	2.197
,		Sex	-21.96462	-1.28367	0.12708	0.00048	.12708	61.771*
	-	Sex X FED	-0.01702	-0.01302	0.13978.	0.01270		0.022
	•	Sex X MED 🔥	0.00719	0.00521	0.14102	0.00124		0.003
	2-	Sex (DU JRB	1.20626	⊲ 0 <u></u> 26777	0.14569	.0.00 45 7	•	2.488
		Sex X FOCC	0.14062	0.56688	.⁴0.15344	0.00775	· ,	15:401*
	•	Sex X TCTFAM	0.42832	0.02495	0.15362	0.00018	.026054	0.216
å ₁₀		Academic Performance	1.47462	0.11107 ⁻	0.20247	0.04885	_	~ 14740*
,		Peer College plans	1.65764	0.08838	0.24401	0.04154		9.825*
	3.	Parent's College Encour.	0.28914	0.02997	0.25075	0.00574		1.176
		Teacher's College Encour.	0.21937	0.02149	0.25098	0.00 024		0.584 -
•	•	Parents Achievement Socializ.	0.04923	0,00522	0.25118	0.00019	.09756	0.034
	<u> </u>	Sex X GPA	1.55543	0.24790	0.25865	0.00747	•	8.724*
	. ,	Sex X PEERCOL	4.41780	0.24938	0.27246	0.01381		33.568*
•	4	Sex X PARENDEN	1.22024	0.31878	0,27554	0.00307		8.263*
		Sex X TCHEDEN	-0.14049	-0.03518	0.27558	0.00005	•	0.112
		Sex X PASFAC	0.40302	0.00806	0.27561	0.00003	.02443	0.082
.*	<u> </u>	Materialistic Orientation	-0.11 606	-0.0±127	Ó.27570	0.00009		0.157
-	5	Personal Competiveness	0.51301	0.02167	⁻ Q. 27666	0.00096	.00105 -,	0.679
	,	Sex X AAO6	0.45911	0.01427	0.27676	0.00009	-	0.273
-	6	Sex X MO	0.00367	0.00026	0.27676	0.00000	.00009	40.00 0
. 0	*P .	.05.			۶-	,	,	. 0.
			.*					32
led by ERIC			•	_		· · ·		
	~	-	_					

Table 13. Main and Interaction Effects for Occupational Plans.

Step	Predictor Variables	ь	BETA R ²		R ² Change		F-Value
١	Father's Education	0.10198	0.03857	· 0`.08453	0.08453		1.198
	Mother's Education	0.11930	0.03384	0.09428	0.00975		1.130
1 .	Residence	1.49238	0.06729	0.11514	0.02086		- 5.625*
-4	Family Structure	-0.66441	-0:02367	0.11556	0.00042	ć	0.763
V	Father's Occupation	0.04327	0.04851	0.14014	0.02459		. 2.289
	Sex	-31.39896	-1,61849	0.14702	0.00688	· \	101.882*
	Sex X Father's Education	0.01947	0.01314	0.16317	0.01614		0.023
	Sex X Mother's Education	0.02001	0.01280	0.16492	0.00175	'	0.017
· ,	Sex X Residence	0.72033	0.03569	0.16811	0.00319		0.716
۷,	Sex X Father's Occupation	0.19108	0.67942	0.17898	0.01088	•	22.953*
•	Sex X Family Structure	0.45373	0.02328	0.17912	0.00014		0.195
`	Academic Performance	1.71561	0.11398	0.23211	0.05299	•	16.103*
-	Peer College Plans	2.24254	0.10546	0.26443	0.03232	•	14.513*
3 '	Parent's College Encouragement	0.23979	0.02192	0.27199	0.00756	•	_0.653
•	Teacher's College Encouragement	0.01639	0.00142	0.27249	0.00050		0.003
•	Parents Achievement Socialization	0.09799	0.00916	O.27555	0.00306		0.110
,	Sex X Academic Performance	1.92413	0.27047,	0.28432	0.00878		10.775*
· .	Sex X Peer College Plans	2.81854	0.14033	0.29043	0.00611	1	11.028*
4	Sex X Parent's College Encouragement	1.56441	0.36047	0,29635	0.00592		10.961*
	Sex X Teacher's College Encouragement	0.48709	0.10759	0.29667	0.00032	•	1.090
	Sex X parent's Achievement Socialization		0.06119	0.29830	0.00163	**	4.914*
5	Materialistic Orientation .	-0.22312	-0.01912	0.29937	0.00108	•	0.467
	Personal Competiveness	0.55478	0.02067	0.30183	0.00246		0.641
	ex X Materialistic Orientation	1.60555	0.04401	0.30268	0,00085		2.696
`.	Sex X Personal Competiveness	-0.37387	-0.02335	0.30292	0.00923	• ,	0.722

^{*}P - 405.

34

Selected References

Alexander, Karl L. and Bruce K. Eckland.

1974 "Sex differences in the educational attainment process," American Sociological Review 39 (October):
668-82.

Bardwick, J.M. and E. Douvan

1971 "Ambivalence: The Socialization of Women." In

V. Gornick and B.K. Moran (eds.), Women in Sexist

Society. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Broverman, I.K. et al.

"Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal," Journal of Social Issues 28 (2): 59-78.

Coser, Rose, L. and Gerald Rokoff
1971 "Women in the occupational world: Social disruption
and conflict." Social Problems 18 (Spring): 535-54.

Curry, E.W. et al.

Forthcoming

'1976 Significant Other Influence and Career Decisions of Black and White Female Urban Youth. Columbus, Ohio: Center for Vocational Education, Final Report.

Pouvan, E. and J. Adelson

1966 The Adolescent Experience. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Epstein, Cynthia

1971 Women's Place: Options and Limits in Professional Careers. Berkely: University of California Press.

Freeman, J.

1970 "Growing up Girlish." Trans-Action 8 (Nov-Dec): 36-43.

·Hochschild, Arlie Russell

1973 "A review of sex-role research." American Journal of Sociology 78 (January): 249-67.

Horner, M.S.

"Toward an understanding of achievement-related conflicts in women." Journal of Social Issues 28 (2): 157-75.

Hout, M. and W.R. Morgen

1975 "Race and sex variations in the causes of expected attainments of high school seniors." American Journal of Sociology 81 (September): 364-94.

Kohn, Melvin

"Social class and the exercise of parental authority." American Sociological Review 24: 312-56.

Levy, B.

1972 "Do teachers sell girls short?" Today's Education (December): 11-15.

Oppenheimer, V.K.

1968 "The sex-labeling of jobs." Industiral Relations 7: 219-34.

Parsons, Talcott and Robert F. Bales
1953 Family, Socialization, and Interaction Process.
Glencoe, ILL: The Free Press.

Picou, J.S., et al.

1976 Significant Other Influence, Career Choice, and Achievement: Selective Theoretical and Conceptual Approaches. Columbus, Ohio: Center for Vocational Education, R&D Report No. 111.

Rosenberg, B.G. and B.S. Smith

1972 Sex and Identity. New York: Holf, Rinehart and
Winston, Inc.

Simon, William and John Gagnon
1969 "Psychosexual Development." Trans-Action 6: 9-17.

Vetter, Louise

1975 "The Majority Mimority: American Women and Careers."
Pp. 224-240 in J.S. Picou and R.E. Campbell (eds.),
Career Behaviors of Special Groups: Theory, Research,
and Practice. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill
Publishers.